



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/773,465

02/09/2004

Kenji Moriwaki

725.1167

3600

21171

7590

03/19/2007

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

SUITE 700

1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BUTLER, PATRICK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1732

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/19/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/773,465	Applicant(s) MORIWAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Patrick Butler	Art Unit 1732	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Patrick Butler. (3) Aaron Walker.
 (2) Christina Johnson. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 March 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: proposed amendments (attached)--Claims 1 and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nishibori et al. (US Patent No. 5,323,971) and Gordon et al. (UK Patent Application GB 2 121 535 A).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

Patrick Butler
 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Walker discussed how proposed amended claims are distinguished from the prior art in terms of degree of pulverization degree, size, motivation for separating vs. continued pulverization, time of pulverizing, and time of pulverization. Examiners Butler and Johnson discussed how Nishibori teaches leaving some film, Gordon teaches separation, and that incorporating the degree of pulverization, if less than Nishibori and supported by Applicant's specification, would distinguish the proposed claims from the prior art of record.

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/773,465 First Named Applicant: Kenji MORIWAKI
 Examiner: Patrick Butler Art Unit: 1732 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Aaron Walker (2) Patrick Butler
 (3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: 3/8/07 Proposed Time: _____ (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ YES ☐ NO

If yes, provide brief description: Proposed Claim Amendments

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>103(a) Rej.</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Nishibori/Gordon</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

See Proposed Claim Amendments

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on 13 March 2007

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Aaron Walker
 Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Aaron C. Walker

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

59,921

Registration Number, if applicable

Patrick Butler

Examiner/SPE Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2

PROPOSED

Serial No. 10/773,465

IN THE CLAIMS:

The text of all pending claims, (including withdrawn claims) is set forth below. Cancelled and not entered claims are indicated with claim number and status only. The claims as listed below show added text with underlining and deleted text with ~~strike through~~. The status of each claim is indicated with one of (original), (currently amended), (cancelled), (withdrawn), (new), (previously presented), or (not entered).

1. (Original) A resin material remolding method comprising:
~~a preparation step of preparing pulverized pieces obtained upon pulverization of a coated resin molded product and coating film peeling of pulverized pieces;~~
a pulverization step of pulverizing a coated resin molded product;
a peeling step of peeling coating film from pulverized pieces obtained in said pulverization step by rubbing using a mechanical force;
a determination step of sensing and determining the presence/absence of adhesion of the coating film for each individual pulverized piece after the preparation step;
a separation step of separating a pulverized piece having the coating film adhered from pulverized pieces having no coating film adhered, on the basis of the determination result; and
a molding step of performing molding by using the pulverized pieces having no coating film adhered after the separation step,
wherein the determination step senses and determines the presence/absence of adhesion of the coating film by sensing the coating film itself or a specific material present in the coating film by using a sensor.

2. (Cancelled)

3. (Original) The method according to claim 2, wherein the determination step executes the sensing by using a photosensor for sensing the coating film on the basis of a difference in lightness, saturation, or hue from a background color set behind the pulverized pieces and different from a coating film color.

4. (Original) The method according to claim 2, wherein the sensing is executed by sensing means for irradiating the pulverized pieces with X-rays, and sensing X-rays having a specific wavelength excited from a specific material.

PROPOSED

Serial No. 10/773,465

5. (Original) The method according to claim 2, wherein the sensing is executed for the pulverized pieces in a plurality of directions.

6. (Original) The method according to claim 1, wherein
the determination step executes the sensing in a specific position midway along a moving path in which the pulverized pieces are moved in a specific direction, and
the separation step executes the separation, when a pulverized piece having the coating film adhered is sensed in the determination step, by blowing a gas against the pulverized piece to change a moving direction of the pulverized piece having the coating film adhered to a direction different from a moving direction of a pulverized piece having no coating film adhered.

7. (Original) The method according to claim 6, wherein the movement of the pulverized pieces is falling.

8. (Original) The method according to claim 1, wherein
in the pulverization, the coated resin molded product is pulverized at random by using a cutting tool having a rotary blade, and
the determination step is executed, after pulverized pieces are classified into a plurality of groups in accordance with particle diameters of the pulverized pieces, for each classified particle-diameter group.

9. (Original) The method according to claim 1, wherein the coated resin molded product is a used automobile part.

10. (Withdrawn) An apparatus for selecting resin material pulverized pieces obtained upon pulverization of a coated resin molded product and coating film peeling of pulverized pieces, comprising:
a sensor placed in a specific position with respect to the pulverized pieces to sense a pulverized piece having a coating film adhered on the basis of the coating film itself or a specific material present in the coating film;
determining means for determining the pulverized piece having the coating film adhered on the basis of the result of sensing by said sensor; and

PROPOSED

Serial No. 10/773,465

separating means for separating the pulverized piece having the coating film adhered from pulverized pieces having no coating film adhered on the basis of the result of determination by said determining means.

11. (Withdrawn) The apparatus according to claim 10, wherein said sensor is a photosensor for sensing the coating film on the basis of a difference in lightness, saturation, or hue from a background color different from a coating film color.

12. (Withdrawn) The apparatus according to claim 10, wherein said sensor is X-ray sensing means for sensing X-rays having a specific wavelength excited from a specific material present in the coating film when a pulverized piece is irradiated with X-rays.

13. (Withdrawn) The apparatus according to claim 10, wherein a plurality of said sensors are arranged to sense the presence/absence of adhesion of the coating film for pulverized pieces in a plurality of directions.

14. (Withdrawn) The apparatus according to claim 10, further comprising moving means for moving pulverized pieces in a specific direction, wherein said separating means is placed in a specific position midway along a moving path of said moving means for moving pulverized pieces and comprises gas blowing means for, when said determining means senses a pulverized piece having the coating film adhered, blowing a gas against the pulverized piece to change a moving direction of the pulverized piece having the coating film adhered to a direction different from a moving direction of a pulverized piece having no coating film adhered, thereby executing the separation.

15. (Withdrawn) The apparatus according to claim 14, wherein said moving means is dropping means for dropping pulverized pieces.

16. (Withdrawn) The apparatus according to claim 10, further comprising classifying means placed in a pulverized piece charge port to classify pulverized pieces into a plurality of groups in accordance with particle diameters of the pulverized pieces, wherein said sensor performs the sensing for each of said plurality of groups of the pulverized pieces.

P R O P O S E D

Serial No. 10/773,465

17. (Withdrawn) The apparatus according to claim 16, wherein said classifying means is a screening device for classifying pulverized pieces in accordance with the particle diameter.

18. (New) The method according to claim 1, wherein said peeling step is performed within a predetermined time, and the predetermined time is set so that the pulverized pieces of which the coating films are not completely peeled remain.